

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

DOI-BLM-UT-G010–2016–0009–DNA

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

Finding of No Significant Impact	ix
QEP Energy Company's RW CPF 27A	ix
Signature	ix
Decision Record	xi
Decision	xi
Summary of the Selected Alternative	xi
Rationale for the Decision	xi
Appeals	xi
Authorizing Official	xii
Conditions of Approval (COAs)	xii
1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)	1

This page intentionally
left blank

List of Tables

Table 1.1. List of Preparers	3
------------------------------------	---

This page intentionally
left blank

List of Equations

1.1. Interdisciplinary Team Checklist	3
---------------------------------------------	---

This page intentionally
left blank

Finding of No Significant Impact

QEP Energy Company's RW CPF 27A

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA), and considering the significance criteria in 40 CFR 1508.27, I have determined that the action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

Signature

Approved by:

/s/ Jerry Kenczka
Authorized Officer

11/30/2015
Date

AFM for Minerals

This page intentionally
left blank

Decision Record

Decision

It is my decision to authorize QEP Energy Company's proposed pipeline extension as described in the proposed action of NEPA document number DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2016-0009-DNA.

Summary of the Selected Alternative

This decision includes the following components:

QEP would build a Central Processing Facility adjacent to well number RW 43–27AGR. Proposed disturbance area would be a 400–foot by 500–foot well pad. The disturbance associated with the well pad would be 5.2 acres. No new access road would be required. QEP would install an 8–inch buried liquids line and two 3–inch or smaller surface lines. The surface lines would be constructed in the same disturbance area created by the buried line. The pipelines would require an additional 0.65 acres of surface disturbance. The total surface disturbance anticipated for the project would be 5.85 acres.

Rationale for the Decision

The proposed pipeline extension meets the BLM's purpose and need to allow the lessee to develop the subject mineral lease indicated above. The need for the action is established by BLM Onshore Orders (43 CFR 3160), which require the BLM to review and approve APDs on all operations conducted on a Federal or Indian oil and gas lease, even with split estate lands.

Appeals

This decision is effective upon the date it is signed by the authorized officer. The decision is subject to appeal. Under BLM regulation, this decision is subject to administrative review in accordance with 43 CFR 3165. Any request for administrative review of this decision must include information required under 43 CFR 3165.3(b) (State Director Review), including all supporting documentation. Such a request must be filed in writing with the State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, P.O. Box 45155, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84145-0155, within 20 business days of the date this Decision is received or considered to have been received.

If you wish to file a petition for stay, the petition for stay should accompany your notice of appeal and shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied;
2. The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits;
3. The likelihood of irreparable harm to the appellant or resources if the stay is not granted;
4. Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

Authorizing Official

Approved by:

/s/ Jerry Kenczka

11/30/2015

Authorized Officer

Date

AFM for Minerals

Conditions of Approval (COAs)

- The conditions of approval, as set forth in the original approval for the RW 43–27AGR well would be adhered to.

Chapter 1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Worksheet

This page intentionally
left blank

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Vernal Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2016-0009

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: QEP Energy Company's RW CPF 27A

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Sections 27, T7S, R22E.

APPLICANT (if any): QEP Energy Company

A. Description of Proposed Action and Any Applicable Mitigation Measures

QEP Energy Company requests approval to install a surface 3-inch poly pipeline in Section 27, T7S, R22E. The project area would be located in Uintah County approximately 28 miles south of Vernal Utah. The proposed pipeline would be an extension of the pipeline that has previously been approved during the approval process for well number RW 43-27AGR.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name*	<u>Vernal RMP</u>	Date Approved:	<u>October 2008</u>
Other Document	<u>QEP's Red Wash EA</u> <u>#2013-0244</u>	Date Approved:	<u>9/3/2013</u>

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

MIN-8: The Approved RMP will provide for a variety of oil and gas operations and geophysical explorations. These activities will be allowed in the VPA unless precluded by other program prescriptions. The stipulations identified for surface-disturbing activities in Appendix K will generally apply to these activities.

C. Identify Applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Documents and Other Related Documents that Cover the Proposed Action

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

September 2013: Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244-EA, Red Wash EA #2013-0244

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g. biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

Lease UTU63010D

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes, the project is adjacent to the well pad constructed for the well RW 43–27AGR. The well pad and the pipelines associated with the project would be constructed in the same manor as the project described in Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244-EA. Surveys for cultural resources, paleontological resources, wildlife, plant and other resource issues were conducted and examined at the time the Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244-EA was prepared. The geographic and resource conditions are the same in the proposed project area as the area analyzed in the Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244-EA. All of the conditions of approval that would be appropriate for this project would apply.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource value?

As stated above, the proposed action is substantially the same. No new issues have been identified that could lead to analysis of new alternatives or mitigation. The alternatives analyzed in the EAs, including "no action", were appropriate for this action. The only difference is the addition of the proposed construction site for the production facility.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes, the proposed action and existing document were reviewed by a team of interdisciplinary resource specialists.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Yes, the effects that would result from implementation of the proposed action would be similar to those previously analyzed. See question 3 in regards to air quality.

Many of the actions included in the proposed action were specifically analyzed in DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244–EA. The current proposed action is within the scope of what was previously analyzed. Mitigation identified in the original NEPA documents would also apply to this proposed action to help minimize impacts. Some of these mitigation measures include re-seeding disturbed areas to mitigate potential for noxious weed growth, all surface disturbance associated with this project would occur on previously disturbed areas, equipment used for construction activity would be power-washed prior to entering the job sites.

5. Are there public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes, scoping and public involvement were carried out in accordance with BLM NEPA Handbook H-1790-1.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Table 1.1. List of Preparers

Name	Role	Discipline
Kevin Sadlier	Team Lead	Natural Resource Specialist

Note

Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Equation 1.1. Interdisciplinary Team Checklist

Project Title: QEP Energy Company's RW CPF 27A

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2016-0009-DNA

Project Leader: Kevin Sadlier

DETERMINATION OF STAFF: (Choose one of the following abbreviated options for the left column)

NP = not present in the area impacted by the proposed or alternative actions

NI = present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required

PI = present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA

NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section D of the DNA form. The Rationale column may include NI and NP discussions.

Determina- tion	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)				
NC	Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Air quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244-EA	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NP	BLM Natural Areas	The project area does not lie in any designated BLM Natural Area following GIS review.	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NP	Cultural: Archaeological Resources	No eligible cultural resources were identified within the APE of the proposed project area.	David Grant	11/20/2015
NI	Cultural: Native American Religious Concerns	No Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) are identified within the APE. The proposed project will not hinder access to or use of Native American religious sites.	David Grant	11/20/2015

Determina- tion	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NP	Designated Areas: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	The project area does not lie in any designated Area of Critical Environmental Concern following GIS review.	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NP	Designated Areas: Wild and Scenic Rivers	None present as per Vernal RMP/ROD and GIS layer review	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NP	Designated Areas: Wilderness Study Areas	None present as per Vernal RMP/ROD and GIS layer review	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NC	Environmental Justice	The proposed alternatives would not likely create disproportionately high and adverse human health impacts or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations since there are none in the project area.	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NP	Farmlands (prime/unique)	All prime or unique farm lands in the Uintah Basin must be irrigated to be considered under this designation, among other factors. No irrigated lands are located in the proposed action area; therefore this resource will not be carried forward for analysis.	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NP	Fuels/Fire Management	There are no past or planned fuels projects in the immediate area. The proposed reclamation activities should prevent additional hazardous fuels.	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NC	Geology/Minerals/Energy Production	Geology/Minerals/Energy Production were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244-EA	Justin Snyder	10/30/2015
NI	Invasive, Non-Native Species (EO 13112)	Invasive, Non-Native Species were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244-EA	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NI	Lands/Access	The Proposed area is located within the Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan area which allows for oil and gas development with associated road and pipeline right-of-ways. The proposed project is within QEP's Red Wash Unit. The Sundry would be authorized under beneficial use of the lease; therefore, this project does not require a ROW.	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NP	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (LWC)	None present as per Vernal RMP/ROD and GIS layer review	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NC	Livestock Grazing & Rangeland Health Standards	There are no additional impacts from the proposed project to the livestock operation than those that were analyzed in the previous NEPA document. No new or previously unknown information has been made available related to the previous environmental analysis.	Craig Newman	10/30/2015
NI	Paleontology	An additional survey has been conducted by Intermountain Paleo Consulting survey IPC #14-20. A copy of the report has been submitted to the BLM. Scientifically important fossils were found. QEP has agreed to provide a permitted paleontologist to monitor any aspect of construction deemed necessary from the surveys.	Justin Snyder	10/30/2015

Determina- tion	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NC	Plants: BLM Sensitive	BLM Sensitive plants were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2013-0244-EA	Jessi Brunson	11/24/2015
NC	Plants: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate	Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate plants were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2013-0244-EA	Jessi Brunson	11/24/2015
NP	Plants: Wetland/Riparian	Riparian habitat is not inventoried or known within the project area and the development would not be expected to negatively impact riparian of the Green River indirectly.	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NI	Recreation	There are no recreation sites in this project area. Recreation will not be effected by this project.	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NI	Socio-Economics	Effects on social and economic values would be minimal and would not require further analysis due to the small-scale nature of the action when compared to the larger economy in the area.	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NC	Visual Resources	Visual Resources were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2013-0244-EA	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NC	Wastes (hazardous/solid)	Hazardous Waste: Hazardous Waste has been sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244-EA Solid Wastes: Solid Wastes were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2013-0244-EA	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NP	Water: Floodplains	Floodplains were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244-EA	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NC	Water Resources Quality (drinking /surface /ground)	Surface: Surface water has been sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2013-0244-EA Groundwater: Groundwater has been sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244-EA	Kevin Sadlier Justin Snyder	10/30/2015 10/30/2015
NC	Water: Hydrologic Conditions (stormwater)	Hydrologic conditions were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2013-0244-EA	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NC	Water: Surface Water Quality	Surface water quality has been sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2013-0244-EA	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NP	Water: Waters of the U.S.	Waters of the U.S. are not present per USGS topographic map and GIS data review. The proposed project would not impact any drainage where a high water mark can be distinguished, drainages which regularly run water, or wetlands/riparian areas.	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015
NC	Wild Horses	Wild Horses were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2013-0244-EA	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NC	Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	Migratory birds were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2013-0244-EA	Dixie Sadlier	10/30/2015
NC	Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated	Non-USFWS Designated were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2013-0244-EA	Dixie Sadlier	10/30/2015
NC	Wildlife: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate	Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate wildlife species were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2013-0244-EA	Dixie Sadlier	10/30/2015
NP	Woodlands/Forestry	Not present in project area as per GIS review.	Kevin Sadlier	10/30/2015

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

Kevin Sadlier

Signature of Project Lead

Kelly Buckner

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Jerry Kenczka

Signature of the Responsible Official

11/30/2015

Date

Note:

The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.